



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,337	02/06/2004	Seok Hwa Jeong	IPS-0017	4505
34610	7590	12/01/2009	EXAMINER	
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP P.O. Box 221200 Chantilly, VA 20153-1200			YENKE, BRIAN P	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2622			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
12/01/2009	PAPER			

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/772,337	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JEONG, SEOK HWA
	<b>Examiner</b> BRIAN P. YENKE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment (09/15/09).
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) all the above is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 18,20-21,30 and 32-36 (claims 1-17, 19,22-29 and 31 being cancelled).

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18, 20-21, 30 and 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi et al., US 5,434,626 in view of Kahn US 6,678,009 and Cohen-Solal, US 7,206,029

In considering claim 18,

- a) the claimed a display screen...is met by CRT screen 36 (CRT Fig 1, screen Figs 4a-4c).
- b) the claimed a processor...is met by PIP 34 and video processing circuit 33 (Fig 1).
- c) the claimed a key input...is met by the remote control which is coupled to the PIP 34/Video processor 33 via receiver 47 (Fig 1).
- d) the claimed an OSD generator is met by display microcomputer 45, which can display the menu 36b (with the main display Fig 4b), with the main/sub (Fig 4c) or not at all (Fig 4a))

As disclosed by Hayashi, the remote can control the subscreen position (36b16, Fig 6a, the screen size 36b17).

Although Hayashi does not explicitly recite the displaying of at least two arrows being oriented in a left/right or up/down direction as claimed.

It is noted that Hayashi discloses including OSD function onto the display screen, wherein the use of a remote control and the displaying of such OSD features are conventional in the art. It is noted that Kahn US 6,678,009 discloses this conventional feature, wherein a user has a user input (Fig 1) and can adjust the size of the screen accordingly using buttons (A, B, C, D), which are displayed on the screen.

Although icons a-d are indicative of position/direction, the examiner will evidence the feature of a remote having arrows by evidencing Cohen-Solal, US 7,206,029 which discloses a remote control which allows the user to adjust the PIP, either in the left/right or up/down direction using button 137a-d as shown in Fig 1.

Thus it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to afford Hayashi which allows a user to adjust the size/position of the PIP to provide selection/indication via the display screen in order for the user to verify/validate their selection.

In considering claim 20,

As stated above Hayashi and Cohen-Solal disclose adjusting the size, position, wherein Cohen-Solal also discloses texture and transparency.

In considering claim 21,

As stated above, Hayashi indicates a current selection (i.e. screen size for subscreen is small).

In considering claim 30,

Both Hayashi and Cohen-Solal disclose making adjustment to the sub-picture which may be dependent or independent (i.e. user preference when done manually) of the main picture.

In considering claim 32,

Hayashi discloses a system where the user can display both the OSD menu and sub-picture on the main picture display screen. Hayashi also discloses that the user may repositions/resize the subpicture display on the screen. Thus in the event the user wished to move the subscreen in the currently placed OSD position, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the capability of the user being able to move such OSD display in reference to such new placement.

In considering claim 33,

Hayashi discloses the user may adjust the picture/sound quality of the sub-picture manually, thus being independent of the main picture.

In considering claim 34,

The combination above does no disclose a level adjustment display section as claimed, however such features are notoriously well known in the art, for the obvious benefit of allowing the user to see their respective changes thus the examiner takes "OFFICIAL NOTICE" regarding such, in the event of a traversal the examiner notes US 6,256,027, Jeong et al.,

In considering claim 35,

Hayashi discloses arrows 62, 63, one pointing left (or down) the other point right (or up). In addition the incorporated Cohen-Solal, discloses 4 arrows, up, down, left, right (Fig 1, 137a-d accordingly).

In considering claim 36,

As stated above the use of arrows corresponding to a display are known. Based upon the particular function whether texture/transparency the arrows would be representative increase/decrease, in position the arrows would be representative of position (up—for increase in length/height, down for decrease in height). In addition to Kahn which discloses the vertical/horizontal shrinking or expansion using such arrows.

#### ***Conclusion***

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Yenke whose telephone number is (571)272-7359. The examiner work schedule is Monday-Thursday, 0730-1830 hrs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, Dave Ometz, can be reached at (571)272-7593.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(571)-273-8300

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703)305-HELP.

General information about patents, trademarks, products and services offered by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), and other related information is available by contacting the USPTO's General Information Services Division at:

800-PTO-9199 or 703-308-HELP

(FAX) 703-305-7786

(TDD) 703-305-7785

An automated message system is available 7 days a week, 24 hours a day providing informational responses to frequently asked questions and the ability to order certain documents. Customer service representatives are available to answer questions, send materials or connect

customers with other offices of the USPTO from 8:30 a.m. - 8:00p.m. EST/EDT, Monday-Friday  
excluding federal holidays.

For other technical patent information needs, the Patent Assistance Center can be reached through customer service representatives at the above numbers, Monday through Friday (except federal holidays) from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST/EDT.

The Patent Electronic Business Center (EBC) allows USPTO customers to retrieve data, check the status of pending actions, and submit information and applications. The tools currently available in the Patent EBC are Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) and the Electronic Filing System (EFS). PAIR (<http://pair.uspto.gov>) provides customers direct secure access to their own patent application status information, as well as to general patent information publicly available. EFS allows customers to electronically file patent application documents securely via the Internet. EFS is a system for submitting new utility patent applications and pre-grant publication submissions in electronic publication-ready form. EFS includes software to help customers prepare submissions in extensible Markup Language (XML) format and to assemble the various parts of the application as an electronic submission package. EFS also allows the submission of Computer Readable Format (CRF) sequence listings for pending biotechnology patent applications, which were filed in paper form.

/BRIAN P. YENKE/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622

B.P.Y  
23 Nov 09